

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

---

Cutter Associates, Inc.,

Plaintiff,

Civ. No. 09-2892 (RHK/JJK)

**ORDER**

v.

Adeptyx Consulting, Inc.,

Defendant.

---

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Pending Outcome of Related Proceedings (Doc. No. 11). Despite previously informing the Court that it intended to oppose the Motion (and the Court, as a result, having taken pains to review the contorted litigation history in this case and two other, related cases), Defendant has now "seen the light" and informed the Court that it does not oppose Plaintiff's Motion. Based on the foregoing, and the Court's own determination that a stay is appropriate, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is **GRANTED** and this matter is **STAYED** pending further Order of the Court.<sup>1</sup>

Date: May 12, 2010

s/Richard H. Kyle  
RICHARD H. KYLE  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> In its statement of non-opposition to the Motion, Defendant purports to "reserve[] the right to request this Court to lift the stay and proceed with this litigation . . . , should that become necessary." (Doc. No. 15 at 2.) Such a "reservation" is meaningless, however. Indeed, inherent in the very nature of a stay is the possibility that a case might be later reopened under appropriate circumstances; what those circumstances might be in *this* case is left for another day.